

WILMINGTON JOURNAL.

DEVOTED TO POLITICS, THE MARKETS, AGRICULTURE, FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC NEWS, LITERATURE, AND GENERAL INFORMATION.

DAVID FULTON, Editor.

GOD, OUR COUNTRY, AND LIBERTY.

TERMS: \$2 50 in advance.

VOL. 2.—NO. 5.

WILMINGTON, N. C., FRIDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1845.

WHOLE NO. 57.

WILMINGTON JOURNAL.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING, BY
PRICE & FULTON, PROPRIETORS.

TERMS

Two Dollars and fifty cents if paid in advance.
\$3 00 at the end of three months.
No paper discontinued until all arrears are paid, except at the option of the publishers. No subscription received for less than twelve months.

TO CLUBS OF

Five new subscribers, to one address, \$11 00
Ten, do. do. do. 20 00
Twenty, do. do. do. 38 00
No attention paid to any order unless the money accompanies it.

We will pay the postage on letters containing Five Dollars and upwards, and money may be remitted through the mail at our risk. The Postmaster's certificate of such remittance shall be a sufficient receipt therefor.

ADVERTISEMENTS

Inserted at one dollar per square of 16 lines or less, for the first, and twenty-five cents for each succeeding insertion. 25 per cent will be deducted from an advertising bill when it amounts to thirty dollars in any one year. Yearly standing advertisements will be inserted at \$10 per square. All legal advertisements charged 25 per cent higher.

If the number of insertions are not marked on the advertisement, they will be continued until ordered out, and charged for accordingly.

Letters to the proprietors on business connected with this establishment, must be post paid, and directed to the firm.

OFFICE on the south-east corner of Front and Princess streets, opposite the Bank of the State.

PRINTING

OF EVERY DESCRIPTION.
Neatly executed and with despatch, on liberal terms for cash, at the JOURNAL OFFICE.

DAVID FULTON,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,
WILMINGTON, N. C.

GILLESPE & ROBESON

Continuing the AGENCY business, and will make liberal advances on consignments of Lumber, naval Stores, &c. &c.
Wilmington, August 1st, 1845.

The Observer and the North Carolinian, Fayetteville, will copy six months and forward accounts to this office.

John S. Richards,

COMMISSION MERCHANT,
AND
GENERAL AGENT,
Wilmington, N. C.

Respectfully refers to
Messrs. J. & E. Anderson, } Wilmington, N. C.
R. W. Brown, Esq., }
Messrs. Woolsey & Woolsey, }
" Richards, Bassett & Aborn, } New York.
A. Richards, Esq., }
June 27, 1845. 41-1f

EDWARD HEALY,

Wholesale and Retail Dealer in
GROCERIES and PROVISIONS,
Hall & Armstrong's Wharf,
Wilmington, N. C.
Jan 13, 1845. 39-1y

CORNELIUS MEERS,

Manufacturer & Dealer in
HATS AND CAPS,
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL,
MARKET STREET—Wilmington, N. C.

GEORGE W. DAVIS,

Commission and Forwarding
MERCHANT,
LONDON'S WHARF, WILMINGTON, N. C.

WILLIAM COOKE,

General Commission Merchant,
AND
Receiving and Forwarding Agent,
Next door North of the New Custom-house,
WILMINGTON, N. C.

ROBT. G. BANKIN,

Auctioneer & Commission Merchant,
WILMINGTON, N. C.
Liberal advances made on shipments to his friends in New York.
September 21, 1844. 1-1f

WM. SHAW,

Wholesale & Retail Druggist,
WILMINGTON, N. C.

JOHN HALL,

Commission Merchant,
One door So. of Brown & De Russell's, Water-st.
WILMINGTON, N. C.

LIST OF BLANKS

ON HAND, and for sale at the JOURNAL OFFICE.

County and Sup. Court Writs
do do Subpoenas
do do Fi. Fas.

County Court Seque. Facias
Apprentice's Indentures
Letters of Administrators
Jurat's Tickets
Peace warrants
Constable's bonds
Notes of hand
Checks, Cape Fear Bank
do Branch Bank of the State

Notes, negotiable at bank
Inspector's Certificates
Certificates of Justices attending Court
Shipping Papers

Any blank wanted and not on hand will be printed with the utmost despatch.

Officers of the Courts and other officers, and all other persons, requiring blanks, or any other work in the printing line would do well to give us a call, or send in their orders. We are determined to execute our work well, and at the cheapest rates for cash. Call at the JOURNAL OFFICE.

Leaf Tobacco.
25 lbs., a prime article, for sale by
Feb'y 21.—[23] G. W. DAVIS.

ALL kind of BLANKS for sale at the JOURNAL OFFICE.

LIST OF LETTERS

REMAINED in the Post Office at Wilmington, N. C., on the 30th September, 1845.
Those whose names appear on this List, will please to ask for advertised Letters.

A.
Allen, —
Adams, Alexis
Adams, Mary A
Adams, John
Anderson, Wm
Antone, Miss Maria
Anderson, Miss Mercury
Artis, Elvin
B.
Brockett, John
Bridger, Reding
Beatey, Thomas
Belle, Sutton
Burr, Henry
Berry, B W 2
Broomage, Thomas
Blanchard, Nancy
Bower, Martha
Bella, Wm
Boon, Wiley
Burnett, Elizabeth
Burris, John H
Boy, J J
Bey, Samuel
Burton, Mary Ann 2
Bryant, Miss Anna
Brace, John H
Bruce, Henry
Burnett, Lucinda
Boudnot, Wm E
Bradley, Anthony
Barton, George T
Burton, Alfred
Banister, Sarah
Brintnall, Thomas
Becont, William
David, M or Bunning, J
C.
Craig, Catharine
Collins, Morris
Collins, Miss J
Corbett, James L
Cambell & Coyle, 2
Clarke, Joseph 4
Cambell, W S 2
Cameron, James
Carlton, N
Craig, J B
Craig, George
Conner, Miss Mary C
Costin, Samuel
Chavers, Henry
Chaves, Lane
Cambel, Jane
Cahoun, Dr P A R C
Cauldwell, Miss Adelle
Corville, Miss A McRea
D.
Deming, capt D 2
Duviss, Joel
Dudley, Alfred
Dow, Noha
Dores, J P
E.
Evans, Green (negro)
Eagles, Richard 2
Eagles, Moses
F.
Foster, David
Foster, T
Foster, Miss Lucy A
Frieze, Rev Jacob
Freeman, F B
Floyd, T 2
French, capt James
Firth, S H
Fountain, Tobias
Fairiss, A G
Fredericks, Z
G.
Gay, Redmond
Gallagher, W
Grant, George
Garrard, Rev T
Gerrard, George A
Gilbert, John
Gary, J, captain of the
Loggins cars,
H.
Hynes, A 2
Howan, M H
Howan, Anthony
Hafer, John
Hall, R P
Hoover, W P
Hoskins, W L
Hartfield, J N
Hamm, Thomas
Hankins, Wm
Hill, Miss Eliza H
Holmes, Nathaniel
Hill, Wm G
Hoster, Mary Jane
Hardie, R W
Howe, Albert
Healy, Edward
Hicks, James
J.
Johnson, Fanny
Johnson, J
Johnson Mary
Joud, James
Jarvis, Wm
Jamestown, M Va
Jones, S W
Jordan, Emily
Jackson, J H
K.
Kerr, George
Keller, John
King & Hall.
L.
Littleton, Miss O
Lotzen, H L
Lucas, A B
Larkins, Aron
Lewis, Simon
Leonard, H
Lewis, Mullington
M.
Miller, Miss Marion
Mott, D J
Marines, A D
Mayo, D L 4
Moore, Miss Mary
McIntyre, D 2
Meeks, S
McKay, K
Mayo, Alfred
McDuffie, Douglas 2
Moore, Miss Elizabeth
Murphy, Rev Thomas
Merrick, Nurray
McNees, Joseph
Moore, Rev W M D
McLendon, John
Moely, Allab
Moore, J B
Martin, Wm
Michael, Wm
Morris, Wm
Moore, Miss Mary J
Mitchell, Alex'r
N.
Neubole, Miss C
Nash, Solomon
Narbuton & Son,
Numere, Anna L
O.
Osborn, J W
Old North State Tent,
i o r R
Price, R A
Pickett, Francis A E
Price, George
Peirce, Peter
Priggs, Gevert
Proctor, D
Prince, James
Providence, Mrs W H
Price, Miss Caroline A
Price, John
Q.
Quinn, Edward 2
R.
Robbins, R 3
Ratgen, Bernard
Rossier, Edward
Russell, John B
Rogers, Bernard
Rollins, Enoch
Russell, Francis
Rus, Casswell
Ricci, D
Ruo, F
Raleigh, George
S.
Simpson, C
Smith, Mrs Anna
Strode, Porter
Smith, John
Smith, J M
Sellers, Samuel
Stoney, Joseph
Sterritt, J W C
Stanley, Mrs C A
Sandford, Alex'r
Steward, Miss Nancy
Springs, Joseph
Shelton & Mallory, 2
Smith, Isabella
Sellers, Cane
Skinner, J B
Searma, J B
T.
Thrift J
Thurston, Wm
Tenchey, Hates
Tappen, H H
Tervis, Miss Anna
Tumor, Maria
Thomas, R
Tenkun, Edward
Tumor, Isabella
Tumor, Mary Jane
U.
Underdew, Noah
V.
Vail, Miss Mary
Van Nortex & co, M F
W.
Willis, J T 3
Ward, Alonzo 3
Woodward, John
Williams, Wm H
Waddell, James Iredell,
U S Navy,
Waddell, Henry
Williams, T
Williamson, James
Wood, D R
Williams, Miss Jane E
Ward, Sarah
Wilkinson, Mrs Julia
Wilmington, J D
W. C. BETTENCOURT, P. M.
October 3, 1845 3-3t

CHERRY HILL, Sept. 27, 1845.
My Dear Sir—You ask me whether, in my opinion, "it be possible, that the conjectures of the Washington correspondent of the Charleston Mercury can be true, in relation to the probable course of the Administration of Mr. Polk in the adjustment of the tariff," and whether "such a course would not be a palpable violation of the pledge to reduce the duties upon foreign imports to the revenue standard."

In answer to these enquiries, I state in the first place, my confident belief that these conjectures cannot be true, and in the second place, that the course they ascribe to the Administration would be "a palpable violation of the pledge to reduce the duties upon foreign imports to the revenue standard," and of all the pledges of the party by which Mr. Polk was elected.

A brief exposition of the true principles of a revenue tariff and a reference to Mr. Polk's Inaugural Address, will be sufficient, I think, to banish your apprehensions. It is obvious to remark that a revenue tariff is the lowest rate of duty upon every foreign import that will raise the required amount of revenue.

The smallest addition to that rate upon any one article with a view to increase the price of its domestic rival, is "plainly and intentionally" a protective, as contradistinguished from a revenue duty. But, if the additional duty not only enhances the price of both the foreign and domestic article, but diminishes the revenue, it would be the most barefaced mockery—the most impudent and hypocritical disguise by which a mercenary and merciless oppression ever attempted to conceal its deformity, to call this a revenue duty. Now it is only necessary to apply these plain, if not self-evident propositions, to the articles which it is the supposed intention of the Administration to favor and protect, by exempting them from the general rule of reduction. Take for example the two leading articles of sugar and iron. Next to salt, these are articles of the most general consumption by all classes of people.

In a great financial and economical reform, reducing the duties upon foreign imports to a general average of 20 per cent., upon what principle of justice, equity or sound policy, upon what shadow of constitutional power, can a rate of duty be imposed upon these articles, higher than the general rate necessary for revenue, at the same time adding to the public burdens and diminishing the public revenue? Is it because sugar and iron are produced by a few wealthy sugar planters and iron masters, not equal in number to one in a hundred thousand of those who consume the articles and pay from the pockets of mediocrity and poverty, the contributions extorted by a free government—and let me not say—a Democratic Administration—to add to the fortunes of a monied oligarchy? Can it be believed, that Mr. Polk, bound by the united principles of interest and duty to sustain the great principles of free trade and unshackled industry, which he has so ably supported through a long course of public service; will now, when elected to the highest station to which ambition or patriotism can aspire, betray his political principles and sacrifice those popular masses, by whose voluntary and unsolicited suffrages he was raised to power? "I trust not the tale." In his Inaugural Address he very distinctly lays down the doctrine that revenue is the object of all duties upon imports, and protection the incident.

Nothing can be more plain. If protection to particular classes at the expense of all others results from a revenue duty—as it does from all revenue duties—it is an unavoidable incident not to be desired but regretted. It is impossible to separate the protection given to the sugar planter, for example, by even a revenue duty of 20 per cent., from the twofold burden imposed upon every body else, not only by raising to the consumers the price of imported sugar which yields a revenue equal to the burden, but the price of domestic sugar, which imposes an equal burden and yields no revenue. It is this last result, which unjustly transfers the money of the many to the pockets of the few, which constitutes the incidental protection of a revenue duty—a result which so far from being desirable to the people at large, can only be regarded as a public evil unavoidably resulting from an unequal system of taxation.

Now let us suppose the duties upon all foreign imports, including sugar and iron, reduced to a revenue standard of 20 per cent., and take up the case of the sugar planters and iron masters at this point. What ground would they have to complain of such an adjustment of the duties upon imports? Could they pretend that any one of these duties imposed a burden upon them not equally imposed upon the body of the people? The whole of these duties would operate precisely upon them as upon others, with the exception of the duties upon sugar and iron, and these while they would operate as taxes upon all the rest of the people, would operate as bounties to them, equal to 20 per cent., upon the whole amount of sugar and iron they produced for sale. Suppose, for example, a sugar planter of Louisiana produces sugar annually to the amount of fifty thousand dollars—probably a fair average, and an iron master of Pennsylvania, iron to the same amount. The amount of other imported, certainly would not exceed ten thousand dollars. Thus under a revenue tariff, these injured citizens would have to pay 20 per cent. on \$10,000, equal to \$2,000 to the government and to their confederate monopolists, and would only receive 20 per cent. on \$80,000, equal to \$16,000 from the great body of the people! Their ground of complaint, then, against the levelling equality of a revenue tariff, would be that they received under it,

only five times as much in bounties as they paid in taxes and bounties united! And what under these circumstances, do they modestly demand of the federal government, and of a free trade democratic administration? Simply that the bounty of twenty per cent., resulting from a revenue duty, be raised to fifty by a protective duty, swelling their clear and real income derived from the system of federal taxation, from eight to twenty-three thousand dollars! This plain statement literally exhibits the character, not only of the protective duties upon sugar and iron, but of the whole system of protective monopoly, and I am sure no honest patriot can think of the unjust, iniquitous and audacious demand made by those bloated and heartless plunderers, that the administration should sacrifice their principles and the vital interests of the people, to secure their allegiance, for the support of the followers and victims, whom they at the same time deceive and plunder, without feeling his blood boil in his veins, with the warmest indignation.

Taking a more comprehensive view of the subject, it may be stated as a fact that the greater part of the revenue from imports, is derived from duties on the class of protected articles, principally sugar, iron, and iron manufactures, cotton manufactures and woollen manufactures. Now all these interests are united together in a plundering confederacy, upon the principle, that each may rob the other, that all may rob the community at large. As I have before stated, each of them would receive at least five times, some of them twenty times as much as they pay, even under a strict revenue system. Is it not apparent, therefore, that to permit those interests to control Congress, in the matter of taxation, would be to put the power of taxation, the most important of all political powers, in the hands of those who have a deep pecuniary interest in increasing the taxes? If the manufacturing nations of Europe would agree to supply the federal revenue by a perpetual tribute, would these monopolists consent to a total repeal of the duties on imports and free the country from taxation? They certainly would not.

They solemnly declare that these duties, which are surely taxes to the country, are essential to their prosperity; that to reduce them from fifty to twenty per cent. would be injurious to them, but to repeal them altogether would be absolutely ruinous. Here, then, is a confession of what is apparent without it, that those who receive the taxes, impudently claim the prerogative of prescribing to the government what burdens shall be imposed on those who pay them! If we submit to these things can we claim to live under a responsible, representative republic? It ought never to be forgotten that a system of taxation, by which three-fourths at least of the public revenue is derived from duties upon foreign manufactures, the like of which are extensively produced in the United States, is the most burdensome and unequal of all the known systems that now exist in civilized nations, reduce and modify it as we may. The whole of the duty imposed on this class of articles, is a discrimination against the imported, and in favor of home made manufacture to the full extent of that duty.

Now when we recollect that all foreign imports, are as truly the productions of domestic industry, as their home made rivals—and that the industry which acquires the foreign article is as much entitled to be exempted from taxation as that which makes the domestic article; it will be seen that the very lowest rate of revenue duties upon sugar and iron, and upon all manufactures of iron, cotton and wool, is an unjust discrimination in favor of one branch of domestic industry, and against another.

The true point of equality and justice, as I have always maintained, would be to impose the same rate of duty on the home made, that we impose on the imported manufacture. The exemption, therefore, of our home made manufactures, from the duties imposed on those we import, is a most liberal concession, gratuitously made by the people to the manufacturers; and that they are not satisfied with this discrimination, is a proof how feeble is the sense of gratitude and justice among masses of men, when their interests are in question. But our system is as burdensome as it is unequal. It may be safely stated that it imposes a pecuniary burden on the people three times as great as the amount of revenue it yields to the Treasury. The duty on imported Cotton manufactures, for example, may be assumed to average 40 per cent., and the amount imported set down at ten millions. This will yield a revenue of four millions. But the cotton manufacturers annually produced in the United States, and equally enhanced in price with the foreign, by the duty imposed on the latter, amount to thirty millions of dollars. Forty per cent. on this, gives us twelve millions as the additional burden imposed on the people, by the duty on cotton manufactures; so that the people are subjected to a burden of sixteen millions to obtain a revenue of four, paying to the cotton manufacturers, who are now realizing from 20 to 40 per cent. on their capital, three dollars for every one they pay to the government! Now let us compare this duty on cotton manufactures, with a like duty on tea and coffee, which the manufacturers artfully prevailed upon Congress to exempt from duty altogether, by the act of 1832. Let us assume that we annually import tea and coffee to the amount of ten millions of dollars, under a duty of 40 per cent. This will yield a revenue precisely equal to that derived from the duty on cotton manufactures, and will impose only one-fourth of the burden on the people. The money collected at the custom house would be the full measure of the popular burden. And yet it is one of the schemes of free of duty, in order to create a necessity for increasing the duties on sugar, iron, and the various manufactures embraced in the protective system. Of all foreign imports, tea and coffee are among the most proper subjects of a revenue duty, inasmuch as they yield the largest amount of revenue with the least burden to the people, and that burden is equally distributed among the consumers. But the manufacturers, who carry their manufactures to China to exchange them for tea, and to Brazil and Cuba to exchange them for coffee, understand perfectly well the benefit of free trade, if it be only confined to themselves. They are like Sir Robert Peel's fisherman, who said to that minister, "I am a free trade man, sir, but you must not touch the duty on fish." I have no doubt, therefore, that a powerful effort will be made by the manufacturers to induce

MR. McDUFFIE'S LETTER.

From the Charleston Mercury.

Mr. Editor—I have seen with some apprehension, the remarks of your Washington correspondent in regard to the probable course of the Administration in fulfilling their pledge to reduce the tariff to a revenue standard.

To relieve myself from the fears excited by those remarks, I addressed a letter to General McDuffie, who I knew had great personal confidence in President Polk, to ascertain his opinion on the subject, and received in answer the enclosed communication, which is very satisfactory to me, and I think will be to the public.

If you concur in this opinion, I hope you will give it a place in your paper.

CHERRY HILL, Sept. 27, 1845.

My Dear Sir—You ask me whether, in my opinion, "it be possible, that the conjectures of the Washington correspondent of the Charleston Mercury can be true, in relation to the probable course of the Administration of Mr. Polk in the adjustment of the tariff," and whether "such a course would not be a palpable violation of the pledge to reduce the duties upon foreign imports to the revenue standard."

In answer to these enquiries, I state in the first place, my confident belief that these conjectures cannot be true, and in the second place, that the course they ascribe to the Administration would be "a palpable violation of the pledge to reduce the duties upon foreign imports to the revenue standard," and of all the pledges of the party by which Mr. Polk was elected.

A brief exposition of the true principles of a revenue tariff and a reference to Mr. Polk's Inaugural Address, will be sufficient, I think, to banish your apprehensions. It is obvious to remark that a revenue tariff is the lowest rate of duty upon every foreign import that will raise the required amount of revenue.

The smallest addition to that rate upon any one article with a view to increase the price of its domestic rival, is "plainly and intentionally" a protective, as contradistinguished from a revenue duty. But, if the additional duty not only enhances the price of both the foreign and domestic article, but diminishes the revenue, it would be the most barefaced mockery—the most impudent and hypocritical disguise by which a mercenary and merciless oppression ever attempted to conceal its deformity, to call this a revenue duty. Now it is only necessary to apply these plain, if not self-evident propositions, to the articles which it is the supposed intention of the Administration to favor and protect, by exempting them from the general rule of reduction. Take for example the two leading articles of sugar and iron. Next to salt, these are articles of the most general consumption by all classes of people.

In a great financial and economical reform, reducing the duties upon foreign imports to a general average of 20 per cent., upon what principle of justice, equity or sound policy, upon what shadow of constitutional power, can a rate of duty be imposed upon these articles, higher than the general rate necessary for revenue, at the same time adding to the public burdens and diminishing the public revenue? Is it because sugar and iron are produced by a few wealthy sugar planters and iron masters, not equal in number to one in a hundred thousand of those who consume the articles and pay from the pockets of mediocrity and poverty, the contributions extorted by a free government—and let me not say—a Democratic Administration—to add to the fortunes of a monied oligarchy? Can it be believed, that Mr. Polk, bound by the united principles of interest and duty to sustain the great principles of free trade and unshackled industry, which he has so ably supported through a long course of public service; will now, when elected to the highest station to which ambition or patriotism can aspire, betray his political principles and sacrifice those popular masses, by whose voluntary and unsolicited suffrages he was raised to power? "I trust not the tale." In his Inaugural Address he very distinctly lays down the doctrine that revenue is the object of all duties upon imports, and protection the incident.

Nothing can be more plain. If protection to particular classes at the expense of all others results from a revenue duty—as it does from all revenue duties—it is an unavoidable incident not to be desired but regretted. It is impossible to separate the protection given to the sugar planter, for example, by even a revenue duty of 20 per cent., from the twofold burden imposed upon every body else, not only by raising to the consumers the price of imported sugar which yields a revenue equal to the burden, but the price of domestic sugar, which imposes an equal burden and yields no revenue. It is this last result, which unjustly transfers the money of the many to the pockets of the few, which constitutes the incidental protection of a revenue duty—a result which so far from being desirable to the people at large, can only be regarded as a public evil unavoidably resulting from an unequal system of taxation.

Now let us suppose the duties upon all foreign imports, including sugar and iron, reduced to a revenue standard of 20 per cent., and take up the case of the sugar planters and iron masters at this point. What ground would they have to complain of such an adjustment of the duties upon imports? Could they pretend that any one of these duties imposed a burden upon them not equally imposed upon the body of the people? The whole of these duties would operate precisely upon them as upon others, with the exception of the duties upon sugar and iron, and these while they would operate as taxes upon all the rest of the people, would operate as bounties to them, equal to 20 per cent., upon the whole amount of sugar and iron they produced for sale. Suppose, for example, a sugar planter of Louisiana produces sugar annually to the amount of fifty thousand dollars—probably a fair average, and an iron master of Pennsylvania, iron to the same amount. The amount of other imported, certainly would not exceed ten thousand dollars. Thus under a revenue tariff, these injured citizens would have to pay 20 per cent. on \$10,000, equal to \$2,000 to the government and to their confederate monopolists, and would only receive 20 per cent. on \$80,000, equal to \$16,000 from the great body of the people! Their ground of complaint, then, against the levelling equality of a revenue tariff, would be that they received under it,

only five times as much in bounties as they paid in taxes and bounties united! And what under these circumstances, do they modestly demand of the federal government, and of a free trade democratic administration? Simply that the bounty of twenty per cent., resulting from a revenue duty, be raised to fifty by a protective duty, swelling their clear and real income derived from the system of federal taxation, from eight to twenty-three thousand dollars! This plain statement literally exhibits the character, not only of the protective duties upon sugar and iron, but of the whole system of protective monopoly, and I am sure no honest patriot can think of the unjust, iniquitous and audacious demand made by those bloated and heartless plunderers, that the administration should sacrifice their principles and the vital interests of the people, to secure their allegiance, for the support of the followers and victims, whom they at the same time deceive and plunder, without feeling his blood boil in his veins, with the warmest indignation.

Taking a more comprehensive view of the subject, it may be stated as a fact that the greater part of the revenue from imports, is derived from duties on the class of protected articles, principally sugar, iron, and iron manufactures, cotton manufactures and woollen manufactures. Now all these interests are united together in a plundering confederacy, upon the principle, that each may rob the other, that all may rob the community at large. As I have before stated, each of them would receive at least five times, some of them twenty times as much as they pay, even under a strict revenue system. Is it not apparent, therefore, that to permit those interests to control Congress, in the matter of taxation, would be to put the power of taxation, the most important of all political powers, in the hands of those who have a deep pecuniary interest in increasing the taxes? If the manufacturing nations of Europe would agree to supply the federal revenue by a perpetual tribute, would these monopolists consent to a total repeal of the duties on imports and free the country from taxation? They certainly would not.

They solemnly declare that these duties, which are surely taxes to the country, are essential to their prosperity; that to reduce them from fifty to twenty per cent. would be injurious to them, but to repeal them altogether would be absolutely ruinous. Here, then, is a confession of what is apparent without it, that those who receive the taxes, impudently claim the prerogative of prescribing to the government what burdens shall be imposed on those who pay them! If we submit to these things can we claim to live under a responsible, representative republic? It ought never to be forgotten that a system of taxation, by which three-fourths at least of the public revenue is derived from duties upon foreign manufactures, the like of which are extensively produced in the United States, is the most burdensome and unequal of all the known systems that now exist in civilized nations, reduce and modify it as we may. The whole of the duty imposed on this class of articles, is a discrimination against the imported, and in favor of home made manufacture to the full extent of that duty.

Now when we recollect that all foreign imports, are as truly the productions of domestic industry, as their home made rivals—and that the industry which acquires the foreign article is as much entitled to be exempted from taxation as that which makes the domestic article; it will be seen that the very lowest rate of revenue duties upon sugar and iron, and upon all manufactures of iron, cotton and wool, is an unjust discrimination in favor of one branch of domestic industry, and against another.

The true point of equality and justice, as I have always maintained, would be to impose the same rate of duty on the home made, that we impose on the imported manufacture. The exemption, therefore, of our home made manufactures, from the duties imposed on those we import, is a most liberal concession, gratuitously made by the people to the manufacturers; and that they are not satisfied with this discrimination, is a proof how feeble is the sense of gratitude and justice among masses of men, when their interests are in question. But our system is as burdensome as it is unequal. It may be safely stated that it imposes a pecuniary burden on the people three times as great as the amount of revenue it yields to the Treasury. The duty on imported Cotton manufactures, for example, may be assumed to average 40 per cent., and the amount imported set down at ten millions. This will yield a revenue of four millions. But the cotton manufacturers annually produced in the United States, and equally enhanced in price with the foreign, by the duty imposed on the latter, amount to thirty millions of dollars. Forty per cent. on this, gives us twelve millions as the additional burden imposed on the people, by the duty on cotton manufactures; so that the people are subjected to a burden of sixteen millions to obtain a revenue of four, paying to the cotton manufacturers, who are now realizing from 20 to 40 per cent. on their capital, three dollars for every one they pay to the government! Now let us compare this duty on cotton manufactures, with a like duty on tea and coffee, which the manufacturers artfully prevailed upon Congress to exempt from duty altogether, by the act of 1832. Let us assume that we annually import tea and coffee to the amount of ten millions of dollars, under a duty of 40 per cent. This will yield a revenue precisely equal to that derived from the duty on cotton manufactures, and will impose only one-fourth of the burden on the people. The money collected at the custom house would be the full measure of the popular burden. And yet it is one of the schemes of free of duty, in order to create a necessity for increasing the duties on sugar, iron, and the various manufactures embraced in the protective system. Of all foreign imports, tea and coffee are among the most proper subjects of a revenue duty, inasmuch as they yield the largest amount of revenue with the least burden to the people, and that burden is equally distributed among the consumers. But the manufacturers, who carry their manufactures to China to exchange them for tea, and to Brazil and Cuba to exchange them for coffee, understand perfectly well the benefit of free trade, if it be only confined to themselves. They are like Sir Robert Peel's fisherman, who said to that minister, "I am a free trade man, sir, but you must not touch the duty on fish." I have no doubt, therefore, that a powerful effort will be made by the manufacturers to induce

only five times as much in bounties as they paid in taxes and bounties united! And what under these circumstances, do they modestly demand of the federal government, and of a free trade democratic administration? Simply that the bounty of twenty per cent., resulting from a revenue duty, be raised to fifty by a protective duty, swelling their clear and real income derived from the system of federal taxation, from eight to twenty-three thousand dollars! This plain statement literally exhibits the character, not only of the protective duties upon sugar and iron, but of the whole system of protective monopoly, and I am sure no honest patriot can think of the unjust, iniquitous and audacious demand made by those bloated and heartless plunderers, that the administration should sacrifice their principles and the vital interests of the people, to secure their allegiance, for the support of the followers and victims, whom they at the same time deceive and plunder, without feeling his blood boil in his veins, with the warmest indignation.

Tears like rain fell, such as Artemisia shed over the grave of Mausoleus.

"Ah, yes!—Y—es, sir! and for some time we have suffered the most horrible fears. He is now at the age when the passions develop. Although we gratify all his wishes, money, liberty, &c.; he evinces many signs of demetation. The most remarkable is, that he is always talking about jewelry or diamonds, which he has sold or given to some woman, all unintelligible. We suppose that he has become amorous of a woman, no better, perhaps, than she should be, and that he has involved himself in burdensome engagements to satisfy his desires. This, sir, is but a conjecture. The father and I are lost in sounding the cause of this folly."

"Well, madam, bring your son here."

"Ah, to-morrow, sir—by all means, at noon."

"That will do."

The doctor respectfully conducted the lady to her carriage, not forgetting to scan the coat of arms and the lackeys.

The next morning the Countess drove to a famous Jeweller, and after having a long time cheapened a set of 30,000 crowns she finally purchased it. She negligently drew a purse from her reticule, found there ten thousand francs in bank notes, and spread them out; but immediately gathering them up, she said to the Jeweller, "you had better send a person with me. My husband will pay him. I find I have not the entire sum."

The Jeweller made a sign to a young man, who proudly delighted to go in such an equipage, started off with the Countess M. She drove to the Doctor's door, and whispered to him, "This is my son, I leave him with you." To the young man she said—"My husband is in his study—walk in; he will pay you."

The young man went in. The Countess and the carriage went off, at first, slow and noiseless; soon after the horses galloped.

"Ah, well, young man," said the physician, "you understand the business, I suppose. Let us see; how do you feel? what is going on in this young head?"

"What passes in my head, sir? Nothing except settling for the set of diamonds."

"We understand all that," said the doctor, gently pushing aside the bill. "I know, I know."

"If the gentleman knows the amount, no more remains but to pay the cash."

"Indeed! Indeed! Be calm—where did you get your diamonds? what has become of them? Say as much as you will. I will listen patiently."

"The business is to pay me, sir, forty thousand crowns."

"Wherefore?"

"How, wherefore?" said the young man, whose eyes began to glisten.

"Yes, why should I pay you?"</